

Group Memory  
Transportation Coop Committee  
July 27th, 2017

July 27, 2017,  
September 28, 2017, (Cancelled)  
November 2, 2017

All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor,  
Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless  
otherwise noted)

**Next meeting: November 2, 2017**

Agenda Committee

John Hoole (Acting for Ray Zhang)

Adriann Cardoso

Panos Kokkas

Robert Newman

Scott McHenry

Bin List & Great Ideas

Report - Ohio experiment on Safe Harbor Indirect Cost Rate (after June 2014) (Ray Z, 12/5/2013)

Some sort of a press release to our different channels on what we are working on, etc. (Colleen, 1/29/2015)

How can we help you with the lean 6 sigma efforts? We want this to be successful. (Tom; 1-26-2017)

Charter / PURPOSE - California Transportation Coop Committee serves to:

- Address transportation funding, procedural and legislative issues related to project delivery from a local perspective. (modified January 2015).
- Enhance the working relationship between cities & counties, COGs and RTPAs, Caltrans, CTC and FHWA. This extends to improving communication with all stakeholders. Collaboration is a key method. (modified January 2015)
- Spread information and improve access to all stakeholders through the use of technology. (modified January 2015)
- Partner with Caltrans and FHWA to improve efficiency and enhance the ability to meet all stakeholder needs. (modified January 2015)

Ground Rules:

Start on time. End on time or early.

Identify if you have to leave early and have an agenda item.

Consensus decisions. You must be able to live with it.

Keep side conversations silent.

Send alternate if you are not able to attend.

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a ~~strike-through~~, but left on the list for one meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

September 19, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
32	<del>Ray Z</del> Mark	get the statutes or the foundation of the Caltrans legal opinion relating to software and data sharing <del>11/7/2013 1/9/2014 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 9/11/2014 11/13/2014 1/29/2015 3/5/2015 5/7/2015 9/24/2015 1/28/2016 3/3/2016 9/22/16 11/03/2016 1/26/2017 3/9/2017 7/27/17</del> <del>7/27/17</del>	<del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/17</del> 9/28/2017

December 5, 2013

Ref. #	Who	What	When
34	<del>John</del> Winton	Send office bulletin/memo on lump sum/pro rata to the group via Lori. (see discussion notes #1)  Winton will continue to do this and work up some sort of a Q&A (see discussion notes under agenda item # 2 from November meeting) <del>Today 3/13/2014 5/01/2014 7/31/2014 11/13/2014 1/29/2015 5/7/2015 1/1/2016 1/28/2016 3/3/2016 5/26/2016 9/22/2016 11/3/2016 1/26/2017 3/9/2017</del>	<del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del> 9/28/2017

From July 21, 2016 meeting

130	Scott	Send CAP Review list and questions to Lori for distribution to the Committee	<del>9/22/2016</del> <del>9/29/2016</del> <del>1/26/2017</del> <del>3/9/2017</del> <del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del> 9/28/2017
-----	-------	--	--

From September 22, 2016 meeting

<del>131</del>	<del>Ray</del>	<del>Follow up with Ct Budgets on HSIP funding swap (See agenda item # 3)</del>	<del>11/3/2016</del> <del>1/26/2017</del> <del>3/9/2017</del> <del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del>
----------------	----------------	---	---

From January 26, 2017 meeting

133	Scott	FHWA will share information on sanctuary cities via e mail as it becomes available. (See agenda item # 5)	On-going
-----	-------	---	----------

134	Winton	Work on developing more sample forms to assist local agencies in getting through the federal aid process.	<del>11/2/2017</del> <del>1/26/2017</del> <del>3/9/2017</del> <del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del> 11/2/2017
135	All for Rick	Review the “do-ables list” and send comments or elaborations to Rick. (mark to send out)	<del>2/10/2017</del> <del>4/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del> 9/28/2017

From March 9, 2017 meeting

136	Scott	Work with local agencies directly – establish a working group for prequalification procedures for construction contractors (Tom M, Erwin, Jason, Osama, Panos) (See agenda item # 6)	<del>5/25/2017</del> <del>7/27/2017</del> 9/28/2017
-----	-------	--	---

From May 25, 2017 meeting

<del>137</del>	<del>Erwin G.</del>	<del>Send out / post to BLOG FHWA Letter and Policy / Procedure regarding submittals of contracts to Caltrans</del>	<del>7/27/2017</del>
<del>138</del>	<del>Germaine</del>	<del>CEQA / NEPA Funding Work Group</del>	<del>7/27/2017</del>

From July 27, 2017 meeting

139	Chris	Send out the sign for SB-1 projects (See agenda item # 5)	7/27/2017
140	Scott	Send out new Best Practices document for ER work to Kristy Oneto for distribution. (See agenda item # 6)	7/31/2017
141	All for Scott	Send any suggestions for improvements for the ER manual to FHWA (See agenda item # 6)	8/11/2017
142	Lamin	Follow up on Hazard Mitigation Plan funding eligibility. (See agenda item # 6)	9/1/17
143	Rick T	Work with RCTF on ICRP and ICAP development solutions for small agencies -	11/2/2017
144	Germaine	Send out an e mail soliciting input from the group on additional items to be considered by the CEQA/NEPA work group (See agenda item # 9)	8/1/2017
145	John H	talk to the Emergency Coordinators in DLA about the concerns brought forward today about ER work.	11/2/2017

Critique from this meeting: none done.

What went well	What Needs Improvement
----------------	------------------------

--	--

Critique from last meeting: None available.

What went well	What Needs Improvement

1	9:00	Introductions	All	
---	------	---------------	-----	--

2	9:05	Ground Rules; Action Items; Review Agenda	Mike Halverson	Understand meeting process and status of action items
---	------	---	----------------	---

3	9:20	Caltrans Update and HSIP / HBP Committee Update	John Hoole	Information Sharing
---	------	---	------------	---------------------

#### Agenda Item 3. CALTRANS UPDATE

3. 1. Now in the process of leadership transition in Division of Local Assistance – Ray returning soon, Robert Peterson returning soon.
3. 2. CT has a web site for SB-1. [www.rebuildingca.ca.gov](http://www.rebuildingca.ca.gov)
3. 3. CTC SB-1 workshops going now.
3. 4. HSIP/HBP:
  3. 4. 1. HSIP is on pace to hit 90 million by the end of the FFY. We will be exceeding the obligation authority of 69 million.
  3. 4. 2. We have 50 million for on-system funding.
  3. 4. 3. We are working on Cycle 9 procedures. We are working on how we will manage the bridge program going forward. We will be looking at ways to be more strategic in fund use – We will meet next month, and will report back.
3. 5. OA Delivery – Next critical milestone E-76 requests should be to the districts by tomorrow.
3. 6.

4	9:50	RTPA Update	Adriann Cardoso Patricia Chen	Information Sharing
---	------	-------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

#### Agenda Item 4. RTPA update:

4. 1. SB-1 principles for implementation and guidelines roll-out have been developed.
4. 2. Equity is a universal concern –
4. 3. We want to expedite projects for the first cycle.
4. 4. We want to see pre-construction allowed.
4. 5. Accountability – We need to get the word out and get projects going, not burden the agencies with reporting requirements.
4. 6. CAL-COG asked us to emphasize operational considerations – put the “O” back in SHOPP.

5	10:00	CTC Allocation Update / Recognizing the Project Delivery Timeline	Mitch Weiss	Information Sharing
---	-------	---	-------------	---------------------

#### Agenda Item 5. CTC Allocation Update

5. 1. We are waiting for Caltrans budgets to provide us Allocation Capacity numbers – This will be presented in the August CTC meeting.
5. 2. Project Delivery Timeline – Controller says you cannot incur expenses before you start getting the cash in the winter. The spirit of the SB-1 law requires us to prioritize maintenance and rehab projects. We are working with the Secretary's office to get clarification on the rules for SB-1 reimbursement for the local streets and roads portion.
5. 3. Chris will send out the graphics LOGO for the SB1 projects. (see upshot # 139)
5. 4. There is an effort under way to publicize the SB1 projects – The CTC is working on a web-based message to communicate progress on SB1 projects.

6	10:10	FHWA Update	Scott McHenry	Information Sharing
---	-------	-------------	---------------	---------------------

#### Agenda Item 6. FHWA update

6. 1. Emergency Relief:
  6. 1. 1. Congress allocated funds for past ER events for FY 15/16, and an additonal 60 million for current ER events.
  6. 1. 2. We have a new Best Practices document for ER – (SEE UPSHOT # 140)
  6. 1. 3. We are putting a new ER manual together – if you have any suggestions for improvements, please contact Scott. (see upshot # 141)
  6. 1. 4. Please send damage assessments in to FHWA as soon as you can – you can modify the assessments later – but get us your best estimates as spoon as you can.
  6. 1. 5. Hazard mitigation plan implementation from FY 15/16 – FHWA needs to follow up on effort being put forward for Hazard Mititation plans, and what is the eligibility regaring FHWA or FEMA (see upshot # 142)
6. 2. A&E consultant contracting
  6. 2. 1. Beginning October 1, enforcement of proper procurement procedures will be more stringent.
  6. 2. 2. Guidance for consultant selection will be coming out soon –
  6. 2. 3. We are focusing annual review on A&E consultant contracts.
  6. 2. 4. CT has committed to have everything available for A&E contracting improvements by October 1. There will be training in all the districts in mid-September. Focus will be on Exhibit 10-C.
  6. 2. 5. There is an on-line training program available for consultant procurement on the Caltrans Local Assistance web site – there are 5 modules – this is a great resource.
  6. 2. 6. New contracts and extensions need to follow the new guidance. Late next week there will be a new office bulletin from CT sent out. Exhibit 10-C submittals will be affected. We are trying to capture fatal flaws prior to contract award.
6. 3. Ten-year Time extensions: We are moving more to evaluating each extension case by case. – there are three criteria we are considering to grant extensions: litigation, complex inter-agency issues, or items outside the local agency control. S
6. 4. LEAP Program: 5 projects nationwide have been selected for the LEAP program.
6. 5. Inactive obligations: There will be a push to get California to the target of 2%. Currently California is at about 10% of the nation's inactive obligation. This is considered as an indicator of the State's ability to effectively expend funds on projects. Be ready to look for a way to get invoices sbumitted for your inactive projects. There is a spreadsheet listing inactive projects on the Local Assistance web site, updated weekly.

7	10:30	Earmark Repurpose	Winton Emmett	Information Update
---	-------	-------------------	---------------	--------------------

#### Agenda Item 7. Repurposing

7. 1. We had a kick off meeting on July 18<sup>th</sup>.
7. 2. Projects must be closed and the repurposing must be within 100 miles radius.
7. 3. Information is available on the Caltrans Local Assistance web site on projects that are eligible for repurposing. Fact sheets must be in to districts by August 18<sup>th</sup> from local agencies requesting repurposing.
7. 4. There will not be any more meetings – we will be using the internet as the primary means of communicating on this. Look at the Q&A from last year.

8	10:45	Indirect Cost Rate Proposal	Marsue Morrill - Audits and Investigations	Working with the Local Agencies
---	-------	-----------------------------	--	---------------------------------

#### Agenda Item 8. Indirect Cost Rate Proposal

8. 1. Caltrans has been delegated the authority to audit and approve ICRP's and ICAP's for local agencies. CT can be a resource and can provide some training, but it would not be appropriate to have CT develop the ICRP's.
8. 2. Local Assistance needs to look into sponsoring training or modules on-line – Caltrans Planning needs to be involved. The Rural Counties Task Force will work on this and report back. (see upshot # 143)
8. 3. Local agencies need consistency in the guidance provided by Caltrans. If there are any inconsistencies, provide Marsue Morrill the details. ([Marsue.morrill@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Marsue.morrill@dot.ca.gov))
8. 4. Local agencies, particularly small/rural agencies, need help in developing ICAP's.
8. 5. Caltrans External Audits will be working with the local agencies to use a risk-based approach to focus reviews and audits of indirect cost rates on consulting contracts including sub-consultants. There will be guidelines on how to review Indirect Cost Rate proposals.

9	11:15	CEQA / NEPA Workgroup	Germaine Belanger	Information Sharing on Status of Workgroup
---	-------	-----------------------	-------------------	---

#### Agenda Item 9. CEQA/NEPA

9. 1. Any ideals for the work group on additional CEQA-related activities for federal reimbursement should be sent to Germaine by August 15<sup>th</sup>. She will send out an e mail soliciting any additional items for the work group to consider. (see upshot # 144)

10	11:35	ER Roundtable	Tom Mattson	Discussion
----	-------	---------------	-------------	------------

#### Agenda Item 10. Emergency Relief Roundtable

10. 1. What can we do to help, not hinder each other to get through the approval process?
10. 2. CT Local Assistance web site has good references and training modules on what is required.
10. 3. Local agencies are looking for clear guidance on what should/could be included as eligible work on the first day a disaster is declared.
10. 4. Federal fund eligibility determinations are not done in real-time – you can do the work but that does not guarantee the work will all be federally eligible.
10. 5. There is also no guarantee there will be sufficient federal ER money available in the allocation to cover 100% of the eligible emergency work. Quick release money is very rare. Typically it takes a year or a year and a half to receive an allocation, and when it comes, it will probably not be sufficient to cover all the disaster-related emergency relief work.
10. 6. Permanent repair work is subject to all CEQA and NEPA requirements.
10. 7. Caltrans HQ Local Assistance A will talk to the Emergency Coordinators in DLA about the concerns brought forward today about ER work.

11	12:00	2015 Priority Work Groups	Group Leaders	Updates
----	-------	---------------------------	---------------	---------

## 2015-2017 Priority Work Group Reports

### Agenda Item 11. 2015-2017 Priority Work Group Reports

11. 1. Where can we best put federal dollars? John H (Lead)– Ross, Shawn, Adriann

11. 1. 1. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Having trouble getting information from others. We are looking for ways to minimize the number of projects with federal dollar participation. Is there a way to pool federal funds for exchange? Any way to provide an incentive? Pat will set up a conference call for the group members

11. 1. 2. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We had a conference call meeting in June. We will get together again. This is really a regional issue. It is very hard to get the local agencies engaged. There is an RTPA report out on this already.

11. 1. 3. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have not had time to follow up with regional contacts on implementation. There is nothing we can do at a statewide level. Regions have to take the lead on this. We cannot trade federal funds on a statewide basis, from one region to another. Federal guidelines restrict the application of federal funds. The federal funds are set for specific things, and for specific projects only, and we cannot make those federal funds more general, available statewide, with less restrictions, in their application. We will get the regions more involved, to wrap this up.

11. 1. 4. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) Progress has lagged. Pat will reach out to the regional partners on this. Regions are so different that things that would work in one region would not necessarily work for others. Pat hopes to summarize the information and send it out prior to the January meeting.

### Transportation Co-op Committee

#### 2015 Priority Goal No. 1

Where can we best put our federal dollars?

### WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS?

This is something that this Committee has talked about off-and-on for many, many years. Each of us will answer the question differently.

According to the notes from the January 2015 Planning meeting, the following are the thoughts/ideas:

- Develop a pilot program to broker these funds i.e. those that have the capability to purchase federal funds from others (probably at some discount) who wanted to save the time and expense of using federal funds.
  - ✓ Not quite sure how we would get started on such a pilot program. We would need some “seed” federal dollars.
  - ✓ Probably some restrictions on the use of the federal funds that would be bought by one Region from another Region.
- Focus federal money to make most efficient use – as I always heard it stated, concentrate the federal funding on the fewest projects possible.
  - ✓ It seems that a lot of programs wanting to spread the money around, give out less than the maximum amount of federal funds to each project and there doesn't seem to be a way to consolidate the local funds to maximize the use of federal funds.
  - ✓ How can we require that the local match funds on Statewide programs are to be provided to the State for consolidation purposes in exchange for more federal funds or Toll Credits?

### CONCLUSION

- 1) There is no simple, global, magic solution to a complex problem. The problem is complex due to the specific/special funding allocations in the State. Pointing to the State (Caltrans) and telling them that the answer is very simple – just exchange all of the federal funds for clean State funding before allocation ignores the fact that State gas tax revenues have declined and will continue to decline with the low price of oil/gasoline.

- 2) It might be possible to include this exchange as part of a State-wide increase in transportation funding, if the increase was of sufficient size.
  - a) Not all of Caltrans work (such as routine maintenance work) is eligible for federal funding.
- 3) Developing a Statewide plan for reducing the federal footprint of transportation projects can be achieved on Programs managed at the State level, such as the Local Highway Bridge Program and the Local Safety Program. A Statewide Plan cannot be developed for Programs managed by the Regions because each Region operates differently and there is not a desire to give up local control.
  - a) For Statewide Programs, Caltrans is concerned about dictating changes without a strong consensus from the Regions and local agencies. Thus, Caltrans will develop tools for the toolbox such as the Bridge Investment Credit Program but will not mandate its use. Caltrans will defer to others to make the mandates.
    - i) For changes to be mandated on Statewide Programs, the Regions and local agencies will have to demand the mandates.
  - b) For those Programs managed by the Regions, the changes must be initiated by the Regions and will not necessarily be uniform or even implemented by each Region because of the differing needs of each Region.
- 4) There is a desire to do something to lessen the footprint of federally-funded transportation projects, but the conclusion is that it will be up to the Statewide Program Managers/Committees and the Regions to determine what is best for their Program or Region.

#### IDEAS

- 1) Set a minimum \$ threshold to federally fund projects. At the State, Caltrans does this with the SHOPP Program. They federalize only those SHOPP projects over \$1mil (Construction Cap), or any Safety project over \$300k. Projects with CON CAP costs less than these minimums are funded with State-Only funds.
- 2) Maximize federal reimbursement percentages. As mentioned, any time project sponsors have more skin-in-the-game than the standard 88.53/11.47 ratio (which is typically viewed as a good thing), it has the unintended consequence of INCREASING the federal footprint by spreading the federal dollars over more projects, rather than fewer. Ultimately to reduce the federal footprint we'll have to push for more large \$\$\$ projects, fewer small \$\$\$ projects, and higher/maximized reimbursement rates.
- 3) For a certain threshold of project, say under \$2mil CON contract, we could federalize ONLY the CON/CE phase. Agencies would fund the PE and/or RW phases with "other" funds then, through either Tapered/Flexible Match or Toll Credits, would get their CON/CE Authorization at 100% fed reimbursement. We probably can't impose this on larger projects where we would be asking agencies to float large PE and/or RW efforts, but perhaps smaller efforts could be handled this way. A side benefit is that agencies would not have to follow federal contract law for the PE/RW phases.....just state contract law. Considering all the issues project sponsors are having with A&E Consultant Contracts, pulling some of these efforts out of the federal requirements seems like a worthwhile endeavor to at least investigate. This also keeps us out of PE>10 issues, or having to pull funds back from projects that go through multiple design/scope/concept iterations.
- 4) Establish a model similar to the Bridge Investment Credit Program (refer to this link [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA\\_OB/2015/ob15-04.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/2015/ob15-04.pdf)) for other funding programs. It is a similar idea to the tapered match – perform certain work using local funds earning credit for the match on larger projects thereby consolidating the federal funds to few projects.
- 5) Promote the exchange of (or, sale of) federal funds for local funds to encourage the consolidation of federal funds on fewer projects
- 6) Use of Toll Credits to also promote the consolidation of federal funds
- 7) Require that match funds be available to others for use on projects to be non-federalized

#### FACTS

- Federally funded projects are typically process intensive, and therefore resource intensive. This makes delivery difficult for smaller agencies that don't have either the resources or the technical knowledge to navigate the federal process.
- There are some 450 municipalities and 58 counties in the state competing for federal funds. The Caltrans Division of Local Assistance burden to administer federalized projects for all those jurisdictions with varying degrees of resources and competence within those jurisdictions managing the projects is obviously overwhelming.



## POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

- A. Caltrans accepts all of the available federal transportation funding, and exchanges that money with STIP, Bridge Toll, or whatever source of state funding, funneling state money back through the MPO's to distribute to the CMA's or local jurisdictions as the case may be. In this scenario, the same match could be applied to the state money to extend the funding, or not.
- In this scenario, the "swap" occurs at the grant source. i.e. – when a call for projects is prepared for \$100 million worth of CMAQ funding for bike and ped improvements, for example, that money is purchased by Caltrans at that time, and the grant is then funded with state money.
  - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
- B. Second to Option A, would be very large jurisdictions combine to buy federal funding. For example LA County, Sacramento County, Santa Clara County and Caltrans would be established as exclusive agencies that are willing and capable of delivering federal projects efficiently, AND have available capital to purchase federal money. Similar to Option A, at the grant source (when a call for projects is being established), these jurisdictions buy the federal money at an exchange of 90 cents on the dollar, and the grant funding is replaced with various sources of local money.
- As an incentive to these jurisdictions, in addition to the 10% gain, would be that Caltrans issues toll credits to these jurisdictions to pay any required match associated with the federal funding.
  - Once the grant funding is replaced with state money, the money is allocated to the various MPO's using similar formulas, and projects compete as they would if it were federal funding.
  - Obviously, these designated jurisdictions could also compete for the various grants just as they normally would.
- C. Purchasing federal funding at the CMA or local level. Where within a county one jurisdiction has a federalized project and is need of additional funding, that jurisdiction could take federal funding from another jurisdiction that is not able to use their federal funding allocation. Similar to Option B, this is done for 90 cents on the dollar
- May not be a preferred option primarily because it is done after the fact and there is too much uncertainty. Also, it is dependent upon a local agency having adequate local funding capital to buy the federal dollars.
  - One way to mitigate the local capital issue would be for Caltrans to issue toll credits to the agency taking the federal money to be used as match.
  - This Option is worth discussing only because it was actually done, and demonstrates that something similar to what this committee is pursuing is very possible if folks are willing to move out of the box.
- D. If we were to be successful pushing back the bureaucratic tide, and actually develop an approved a way to "clean" federal money for the majority of California jurisdictions, we still would identify those jurisdictions in the state, with proven track records of delivering federally funded projects, to be eligible to compete to deliver federal grant projects.

## PROS:

- Gives smaller jurisdictions a better opportunity to deliver much needed transportation projects with their limited resources.
- Relieves the burden on Caltrans Division of Local Assistance. This point cannot be overstated enough. Think about the workload for local assistance dealing with the same 5 to 10 well trained and well equipped jurisdictions on federal projects, versus 200.
- By placing the federal money in the hands of those agencies that are well equipped to deliver federalized projects, the delivery rate on federal projects improves. Process becomes more easily standardized, less cumbersome, and easier to control/administer. Makes locals, Caltrans, MPO's, CMA's and FHWA happy.

## CONS:

- None are obvious other than the fact that Caltrans and FHWA need to look at funding from a "new" (Ahhhhhhh!!!) perspective.

## Next steps for 11.1

11. 1. 5. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We need to keep focused on this issue;
11. 1. 6. Ray will continue the conversation in HQ to market the ideas for the paper, "[WHERE CAN WE BEST PUT OUR FEDERAL DOLLARS? \(see upshot # \)](#)"
11. 1. 7. (Comment from 03-03-2016) No report today.
11. 1. 8. (Comment from 07-21-2016) No report today.

11. 1. 9. (comment from 9/22/2016) I am proposing to use the OBAG2 grant as a case study for how federal dollars can be purchased by larger agencies with federal projects from smaller agencies, providing the smaller agencies with "clean" non-federalized funding. This is being set up currently at the CMA level with the Solano Transportation Authority. I will discuss this with Adriann and the rest of the committee. I would like to report to TCC on the outcome of this and how it worked.

11. 1. 10. (comment from 11/03/2016) We are waiting for the pilot to be developed. We will get back together to see if we have any other examples. John will be the lead, and the group will report back in January.

11. 1. 11. (comment from 1/26/2017) We will try to pilot this. We have a meeting on February 10<sup>th</sup>. We will be discussing what we should do next. L

11. 1. 12. (comment from 3/09/2017) We met in early February. We are continuing and will report at the next meeting.

11. 2. Tiered Certification system Winton (Lead) - Adriann, Mike S, Ross, Sylvia F, Ian H. .

11. 2. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Working on what the minimum qualifications would be. Not working on the tiered aspect now. Jean will be sending information out on certification programs in other states to the work group lead.

11. 2. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) We had a conference call a week ago. Team decided the goal is establish MQ's for all local agencies to be able to qualify to administer federally funded projects; develop a draft set of the MQ's and present to this group by the end of the year – last meeting for 2015; November meeting. We also want to present this to the League/CEAC meeting in March 2016. We are focusing on local public agencies, vs. NGO's. We are meeting monthly – next meeting will be June 2; then following the July TCC meeting. We will be researching various states for best practices.

11. 2. 3. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have met a few times. We are combining parallel efforts. We looked at five different states' processes. Based on those, we are tabulating the information that will be applicable to California. We will be putting something on the table by November, for presentation to the TCC.

11. 2. 4. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We had a brief discussion and put together a matrix of new MQ's for agencies to enter into the federal aid process. This is intended to ensure they have the proper financial reporting system in place, and verify they have the ability to actually deliver the projects. Also this is intended to enable them to administer the process more efficiently. The next step would be to certify or tier more experienced agencies – They would be at a higher level of certification with more privileges associated with that level; agencies at lower levels of certifications would require more oversight. Agencies that do not meet the MQ's would have items identified for them which would need to be in place for them to administer federal funds. We would encourage them to partner with agencies that are more experienced.

11. 2. 5. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We are looking at Fiscal, Staffing and Delivery as three domains. We have taken examples from other states. If you have any comments on the matrix send them to provide Winton comments.

11. 2. 6. (Comment from 01-28-2016) We have a matrix of minimum qualifications. Three areas: Staffing, fiscal and delivery. With new agencies entering into the system, we need to be able to help them through. For agencies struggling, we need to help them get back on track. By spending more time at the front end to help agencies move forward, we can spend less time on the back end. This needs to be marketed properly- "This is your path to success."

#### Next steps for 11.2

11. 2. 7. Review the material distributed by Winton. Can you make any suggestions to streamline or improve it?

11. 2. 8. We will continue to refine the definitions. How do we define deficiencies? How do we work with existing agencies who are already in the federal aid process? How do we implement this?

11. 2. 9. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We are awaiting comments from the group and will reconvene to see what the next steps are.

11. 2. 10. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Review Handout (Draft application & interview questions) and provide comments / input to Winton prior to 9/22 meeting

11. 2. 11. (comment from 9/22/2016) MQ Matrix was produced. We borrowed from other states – Arizona, Washington state. Initially there will be a provisional master agreement with the agency. We will have agencies do pilot projects, followed by compliance review. The result of this will ultimately allow agencies to receive certification allowing them to self-administer projects. (see handout, "Local Agency Certification to Administer Federal/State Transportation Projects.)

11. 2. 12. (comment from 9/22/2016) Next steps: Provide comments to Winton on the handout – We will get an update on Nov 3. (see upshot # 132)

11. 2. 13. (comment from 11/03/2016) We will be incorporating your comments between now and the January meeting.
11. 2. 14. (comment from 1/26/2017) We have received some comments – we have established a matrix, compared information from other states/ We are very close to culminating this effort – We have created a glossary, developed draft documents, sketched out steps for the application process to become self-certified. We will have a pilot process. Documents and procedures will eventually be posted on the LA website before March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. New agencies will be required to go through the process.
11. 2. 15. (comment from 3/09/2017) We will continue with our plan – We will try to hammer out a few more items for the procedure. We will be putting a web page out that will deal with the self-certification process/procedure. We have a final draft of this – we have about half of the procedure done.
11. 2. 16. (Comment from July 2017 ) No new progress – Presentation will be planned for August RTPA meeting.
- ~~11. 3. Unobtrusive project performance data collection methods Scott M (Lead) Mark, Mike P, Rose, Renee (comment from 11/03/2016) This is closed today~~
11. 4. &E Procurement Oversight Mark (April, acting) – overall lead, Rick, Tom, Scott and Mike P
11. 4. 1. (Comment from March 2015) Hoping to schedule the kickoff in the next couple of weeks.
11. 4. 2. (Comment from 5/7/2015) We had a kickoff meeting – We identified four items: On call consultants, pre-qualification, oversight and training. We are collecting issues we need to resolve. We will have further discussions for clarity. For on-call, we are going to look at State of Missouri and Oregon to see what their best practices are. We will be contacting Iowa for pre-qualification information. For oversight, we will try to find agencies that have done well – For Training – we will be looking a guidance in the procedures manual. For our team, the next step is contacting the other states. We will meet in the next couple of weeks. We hope to have the meetings set up with the other states by the end of May.
11. 4. 3. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Suggestion – may need to go with a regional approach.
11. 4. 4. (Comment from 5/7/2015) Avoid scope creep, stay focused.
11. 4. 5. (Comment from 7/23/2015) We have looked at Oregon and Iowa information. We will be following up with at least Oregon. We are moving on oversight and training aspects. We have 5 more A&E contract training sessions. There will be a need for legislative action to support this strategy and give Caltrans the authority to do this.
11. 4. 6. (Comment from 9/23/2015) We have looked at best practices. We will be meeting today to determine our next step. We are following two strategies – on-call contracts and pre-qualification of consultants. We have a meeting with CT Legal to discuss our approach with them.
11. 4. 7. (Comment from 11-12- 2015) We have legal advice on what we can actually do. We do not have a plan at this time, but we hope to have something to report on before the January meeting. On the training side, we delivered 5 trainings. There is one more training set for January.
11. 4. 8. (Comment from 01-28-2016) On call consultant contracts with task orders would require legislation
11. 4. 9. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Pre-qualified A&E contractor list would be easier to implement than the procurement model, with on-call contractors.
11. 4. 10. (Comment from 01-28-2016) Caltrans proposed a Budget Change Request to conduct a robust, pro-active oversight of local agency consultant procurement process. To do this they would establish a Consultant Contract Oversight Unit, similar to Construction Oversight Engineer role. They would Identify and advise on deficiencies before they become penalties/sanctions; LGA corrects and recovers. They would perform up to 150 contract procurement reviews annually. Reviews would be conducted for Pre-advertisement, Pre-selection and Pre-execution phases

#### Next steps for 12.4

11. 4. 11. Survey agencies to see if there is a lot of interest in pursuing the Oregon model. (On-call contracts) Find out who will support it and who would want to use the service if we move forward with it.
11. 4. 12. Survey the RTPA's and the MPO's to see who does pre-qualification list procurement.
11. 4. 13. Table the prequalification list option, for small contracts.
11. 4. 14. (Comment from 03-03-2016) We will develop the survey and get it out before the next meeting.
11. 4. 15. (Comment from 07-21-2016) Survey was sent out and completed...now compiling results
11. 4. 16. (comment from 9/22/2016) Proposal – option 1 Caltrans manages on call A&E consultant contracts. Option 2: Caltrans maintains a list of pre-qualified consultants for local agencies. This would require

legislation. Roughly one out of four responses said they would receive benefits from on-call consultant process. Smaller agencies in rural areas would be most likely to benefit. "Pre-Qualified consultant list" has much more broad appeal, with a fifty-fifty split. The majority of agencies would prefer prequalified list over an on-call list. These statistics do not weigh agencies in terms of their size – The intention was to have one response per agency, but we are unsure this was actually the case. Detailed results are available on the website for Local Assistance. We will be meeting again to discuss the next steps. The survey was conducted in April and May of this year, and there were 370 responses.

11. 4. 17. (comment from 11/03/2016) Prequalified list would be useful to more agencies than an on-call contract process. We will discuss this in January to see what the next steps are. This is a bigger issue than just A&E procurement.

11. 4. 18. (comment from 1/26/2017) Smaller agencies are struggling with the whole process of getting federal aid projects through the process. .

11. 4. 19. (comment from 3/09/2017) We have not had a chance to meet in the last 6 weeks- we have a meeting set for later this month.

11. 4. 20. (comment from July 2017) Will meet next week. Have held two meetings since March.

12	12:20	Meeting Wrap-up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Action Items</li> <li>• Discuss 9/28 Meeting</li> </ul>	All	Preparation for upcoming meeting
----	-------	---	-----	----------------------------------

Agenda Item 12. Wrap up

12. 1. Next meeting is November 2.

13	12:30	Adjourn		
----	-------	---------	--	--

Next Meeting Dates:	September 28, 2017(Cancel???); November 2, 2017	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport (unless otherwise noted)
---------------------	--	--

For questions about this agenda, please contact:  
mail:

Kristy Oneto, Caltrans Division of Local Assistance, e-

[Kristy.Oneto@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Kristy.Oneto@dot.ca.gov)

Office: (916) 653-4346

Filename: Agenda TCC 2017-07-27 (final).doc  
07-12 ko

Revised 2017-